

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Joshua Jerel White,)	Case No. 5:23-cv-04010-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Michael Rasar, Deputy Jackson,)	
Savannah Kiers,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's complaint alleging violations of his civil rights. ECF No. 35. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On January 22, 2024, Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 66. Defendants filed a response in opposition. ECF No. 68. Plaintiff filed an amended motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 78. Defendants filed a response in opposition. ECF No. 84. On February 2, 2024, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 67. Plaintiff filed a document titled "Objection," Defendants filed a reply, and Plaintiff filed a document titled "Second Objection to Defendant's Summary Judgment." ECF Nos. 89, 90, 92. On July 30, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff's first motion for summary judgment be found as moot, that Plaintiff's second motion for summary judgment be denied, and that Defendants' motion be granted. ECF

No. 96. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and the time to do so has lapsed.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

As noted above, Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. Upon review for clear error, the Court adopts the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff’s first motion for summary judgment [66] is **FOUND as MOOT**, Plaintiff’s second motion for summary judgment [78] is **DENIED**, and Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [67] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

September 16, 2024
Spartanburg, South Carolina